



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,227	11/19/2001	Yusuke Tsutsui	492322002500	8107

25227 7590 01/28/2004

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

AWAD, AMR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,227

Applicant(s)

TSUTSUI ET AL.

Examiner

Amr Awad

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/6/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii (European Patent Publication NO. EP 1020840 provided by the Applicant) in view of Kornher et al. (US patent NO. 5,745,088).

As to independent claim 1, Ishii (figure 1) teaches an active matrix display that includes a plurality of pixel element electrodes disposed in a matrix configuration (col. 7, Paragraph # 24), and a plurality of retaining circuit (memory circuit 103) disposed for the pixel element electrodes, wherein the active matrix display device operates under two operation modes one mode is a normal operation mode and the other mode is a memory operation mode in which a digital image is presented based on a voltage held by the retaining circuit (col. 7, line 55 through col. 8, line 39).

Ishii does not teach that at least one of the retaining circuits is disposed as a common retaining circuit for two or more of the pixel elements, and the two or more of the pixel element electrodes shares output of the common retaining circuit.

However, Kornher (figure 1) teaches an array of pixels (10) having receiving elements (11) and a plurality of retaining circuits (memory cells 12) wherein the

retaining circuits are disposed as common for two or more of the pixel elements (col. 2, lines 25-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Kornher having the retaining circuit shared by two or more of the pixel element electrodes, to be incorporated to Ishii's device so as motivated by Kornher, to be able to have a single memory cell controls a set of multiple elements, which reduces the circuitry per element, and therefore reduce the cost of the device and increase the manufacturing yields, and also reduces the rate of loading data, which reduces the pin-counts and lowers the frequency requirements (col. 1, lines 55-63).

As to claims 2-3, in Kornher's device is shown to have a common retaining circuit (12) shared by four pixel elements (claim 3) (col. 2, lines 51-54). However, Kornher states that each memory cell (12) has a fanout of four elements, but the invention is applicable to other fanout values, which fairly reads on claim 2 (col. 2, lines 26-32).

As to independent claim 4, the claim is substantially similar to independent claim 1 except that claim 4 recites, "Wherein the number of the retaining circuits is smaller than the number of pixel elements". Such limitation is similar to the limitation of claim 1 having the retaining circuits disposed as common retaining circuit for two or more of the pixel elements, which as shown above taught by Kornher. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 equally applies to claim 4.

As to claims 5-6, in Kornher's device is shown to have the number of common retaining circuits (12) is 1/4 the number of the pixel elements (claim 6) (col. 2, lines 51-

Art Unit: 2675

54). However, Kornher states that each memory cell (12) has a fanout of four elements, but the invention is applicable to other fanout values, which fairly reads on claim 5 (col. 2, lines 26-32).

As to claim 7, the claim is substantially similar to claim 4 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 4 above.

As to claims 8-9, in Kornher's device is shown to have the number of common retaining circuits (12) is 1/4 the number of the pixel elements (claim 9) (col. 2, lines 51-54). However, Kornher states that each memory cell (12) has a fanout of four elements, but the invention is applicable to other fanout values, which fairly reads on claim 8 (col. 2, lines 26-32).

As to claim 10, Kornher states "each (memory cells" having a single bit storage capacity. However, the scope of the invention could also include "memory cells" that store more than one bit or that have additional logic circuitry", (col. 2, lines 37-41). Such teaching fairly reads on the limitation of claim 10.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed November 6, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that teachings of Ishii relate to the memory operation mode and not to the normal operation mode. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim as presented is broad enough to read on the claimed limitations. The normal mode is simply a mode in which pixel element electrode receives a pixel element voltage in

response to an inputted image signal. There is no specific recitation in the claim that precludes the examiner from using data that is stored in the memory for the normal mode. In other word, the received voltage can be stored in memory. The question is whether Ishii shows two modes or not. As shown above, Ishii shows two different display modes. Applicant (page 4) argued that the combination of Ishii and Kornher would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The two reference are from the same field and the motivation of combining the two reference together is clearly stated in the office action above.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amr Awad whose telephone number is (703)308-8485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, between 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached on (703)305-9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-4750.



A.A.
January 23, 2004